



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,167	12/29/2000	Merle L. Miller	2069.008600	8941
23720 7590 12/10/2008 WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042				
EXAMINER JAMAL, ALEXANDER				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/10/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/752,167

Applicant(s)

MILLER, MERLE L.

Examiner

ALEXANDER JAMAL

Art Unit

2614

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-12 and 19-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Based upon the submitted amendment, the examiner notes that claims 9,19,22 are amended and claims 1-8,13-18,23,24 are cancelled.
2. The examiner submits a new set of non-final rejections for the claims, and maintains the previously cited art rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. **Claims 9-12,19-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims all recite either a 'feedback loop' or a 'first loop' with an input and output that are coupled via a switch. The specification states that only relevant circuits are shown in the drawings and referenced in the spec and that other circuits may be present. It is not clear exactly where the 'input' and 'output' of the feedback path are. For the purposes of examination, the examiner assumes the input/output can be broadly

read, as they are in the previous prior art rejection (repeated below), and again broadly read in the new rejection based on new prior art.

The claims all recite a 'lesser current' flows through at least one component, it is not clear how less current would only flow through one component on the loop when the loop was bypassed as all the components would be in series and all would receive less current. Further, it is not clear exactly what the current is lesser than.

Correction/Clarification is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 7-13, 18-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moyal et al [US 5,809,109].

Regarding claim 9, Moyal et al disclose an apparatus, as shown in Fig. 4, comprising: a feedback path having an input and output terminal (18, 20), the feedback path including an analog-to-digital converter (110) for processing voice signals (Vin) [Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 19-38] ;

a switch (105) for coupling the input and output terminal of the feedback path in response to receiving a control signal (i.e. ring command) [Fig. 4; col. 3, lines 11-18]; and
a ringing generator (202) for providing a ringing signal to a subscriber line in response to the control signal [Fig. 4; col. 3, line 47-63; col. 4, line 39 to col. 5, line 2]. Less current will flow through the A/D with V_{in} , than with the ringing signal because V_{in} is digital level and a ringing signal is inherently greater as it must drive a telephone line. And as such would cause more current to flow through the A/D.

Regarding claim 22, Moyal et al disclose an apparatus, as shown in Fig. 4, comprising:

means (SLAC 4) for processing a signal received over a subscriber line by one or more components in a first path [SLIC 2], the first path having an input terminal (18) and an output terminal (20) [Fig. 4];

means (DSP 120) for receiving a control signal (Ring command);

means (switch 105) for coupling the input and the output terminal of the first path in response to receiving the control signal [Fig. 4; col. 4, line 51 to col. 5, line 2]; and

means (ring generator 202) for providing a ringing signal to the subscriber line responsive to the control signal [Fig. 4; col. 2, line 41 to col. 5, line 20].

Claim 19 is essentially similar to claim 22 and is rejected for the reasons stated above a propos of claim 22.

Regarding claim 18, Moyal et al disclose an apparatus, as shown in Fig. 4, comprising:

means (DSP 120) for using an analog-to-digital converter for processing voice signals [Fig. 4;

col. 3, lines 19-39];

means (DSP 120) for using the analog-to-digital converter for DC feed control signal [Fig. 4; col. Col. 3, lines 40-45; col. 4, line 8-20; col. 5, lines 31-50];

means (DSP 120) for receiving a ringing control (Ring command) [Fig. 4];

means (ringing generator 202) for transmitting a ringing signal to a subscriber line in response to the ringing control signal [Fig. 4; col. 2, line 41 to col. 5, line 20; col. 3, lines 11-18];

means (A/D converter 110) for receiving a portion of the ringing signal from the subscriber line [col. 2, lines 47-64];

means (A/D converter 110) for converting the portion of the ringing signal to a digital signal using the analog-to-digital converter(110) [Fig. 4];

and

means (DSP 120) for providing a ring-trip indication in response to the digital signal [Fig. 4; col. 2, lines 57-64; col. 3, lines 40-45; col. 6, lines 24-32].

Claims 13, 1 and 7 are essentially similar to claim 18 and are rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 2, Moyal et al further disclose the method, wherein the ringing signal comprises an AC signal [col. 2, lines 57-64].

Regarding claim 3, Moyal et al further disclose the method, including terminating the ringing signal in response to the ring-trip indication [col. 3, lines 19-35].

Claim 8 is essentially similar to claim 3 and is rejected for the reasons staed above.

Regarding claim 23, Moyal et al further disclose the method, comprising using the analog-to-

digital converter (110) for DC control [Fig. 4].

Regarding claims 10-12, 20-21 and 24, the limitations are shown above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moyal et al as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Anderson et al [US 6,728,370 B1].

Regarding claim 14, Moyal et al do not teach expressly using an integrated subscriber line.

However, it is well-known in the art.

Anderson et al teach using a subscriber line integrated circuit, wherein the voltage subscriber line interface circuit (515) [Fig. 5; col. 5, lines 45-62].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Anderson et al with Moyal et al to provide an alternative embodiment

of the SLIC of Moyal et al to reduce a production cost and compact signal process using the SLIC [Anderson et al; col. 5, lines 45-54].

Regarding claim 15, Anderson et al further teach a line card (integrated SLIC), wherein the subscriber line interface circuit is for receiving a data signal in a frequency band above voice signals [Fig. 1; col. 3, 54-59].

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Moyal et al and Anderson et al teaches the method, wherein the ringing signal comprises an AC signal [Moyal et al; col. 2, lines 57-64].

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments that the input/output of Moyal is not the same as that of applicant's device, the examiner reads the 'input' and 'output' of a loop broadly and contends that Vin and the input to the A/D would read on the input/output as claimed.

As per applicant's arguments that lesser current will not flow through Moyal's path the examiner disagrees and contends that the signal Vin by Moyal will provide less voltage (and as such less current) than the analog ringing signal driving the subscriber loop (which is bypassed by Moyal's disclosed switch).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300** for regular communications and **571-273-8300** for After Final communications.

/Alexander Jamal/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614

Examiner Alexander Jamal

December 11, 2008